

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/444,298	11/22/1999	MAMORU NISHIMURA	PM-265035	8478	
7:	590 06/17/2003				
LARRY S. NIXON NIXON & VANDEHYE P.C. 1100 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 8TH FLOOR			EXAMINER TRAN, HIEN THI		
			1764	- 21 - 24 - 24	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					M			
		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/444,29	8	NISHIMURA ET AL.				
		Examin r		Art Unit				
		Hien Tran		1764				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	opears on the	c ver sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no even ply within the statude will apply and will te, cause the apple.	ent, however, may a reply be time story minimum of thirty (30) days I expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01	April 2003 .						
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ T	his action is	non-final.					
3) Disp sit	Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1,3,5 and 7-11 is/are pending in the	application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from cor	nsideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,3,5 and 7-11</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
· ·	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election re	equirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
,	The specification is objected to by the Examin							
10)🛛	The drawing(s) filed on <u>11/22/99</u> is/are: a)∏ a							
_	Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
11)[]	The proposed drawing correction filed on			ved by the Examiner.				
_	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	•	ice action.					
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer.						
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pricapplication from the International Bee the attached detailed Office action for a lis	ureau (PCT	Rule 17.2(a)).					
14) 🗌 <i>A</i>	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	stic priority un	ider 35 U.S.C. § 119(e	e) (to a provisional application).				
) The translation of the foreign language pracknowledgment is made of a claim for domes							
Attachmen	t(s)	-						
2) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)			r (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

- 1. Figures 6-7 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
- 2. The drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the drawings to comply with CFR 1.84(p)(5), e.g. they should include the reference sign(s) mentioned in the specification and vice versa.

Specification

3. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 10-11, it is unclear as to where the "insertion" is disclosed in the specification.

Application/Control Number: 09/444,298

Art Unit: 1764

ì

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 8. Claims 1, 5 and 7, 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamaguchi et al (4,849,275) in view of Leyrer et al (5,371,056).

Hamaguchi et al discloses a honeycomb structural body comprising: a plurality of cells having through-holes formed by providing partition walls composed mainly of cordierite which has the chemical composition SiO₂: 45-55%; Al₂O₃: 33-42%; MgO: 12-18%, in a honeycomb fashion (abstract), a pore volume of said partition walls being at least 30% (col. 3, lines 21-28), mean size of fine pores in the partition walls is 1-10 μm (col. 3, lines 28-30), said honeycomb structural body being a catalyst carrier for the internal combustion engine, the catalyst carrier having a catalyst loaded on the surface of the partition walls (abstract).

Application/Control Number: 09/444,298

Art Unit: 1764

1

The apparatus of Hamaguchi et al is substantially the same as that of the instant claims, but fails to disclose the specific cell density and the roughness surface as claimed.

However, Leyrer et al discloses provision of a cordierite catalyst honeycomb having a cell density of 100 cell/cm² (645 cells/in²) and a roughness surface which falls within the instant range.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to select an appropriate roughness surface with specific density as taught by Leyrer et al in the apparatus of Hamaguchi et al so as to enhance catalyst coating and to have a more efficient catalyst carrier.

9. Claims 3, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamaguchi et al (4,849,275) in view of Leyrer et al (5,371,056) as applied to claims 1, 5, 7, 9-11 above and further in view of Abe et al (5,680,503) or Hamanaka et al (5,938,992).

The apparatus of Hamaguchi et al is substantially the same as that of the instant claims, but fails to disclose the specific thickness of the partition walls as claimed.

However, Abe et al and Hamanaka et al discloses provision of a cordierite catalyst honeycomb having a cell density of 600 cells/in^2 and thickness of $40 \mu m$ which falls within the instant range (col. 8, lines 39-40 in Abe et al and col. 4, line 52 in Hamanaka et al).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to select an appropriate thickness of the partition walls as taught by Abe et al or Hamanaka et al in the apparatus of Hamaguchi et al to have a more efficient catalyst carrier.

Art Unit: 1764

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 5, 7-11have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hien Tran whose telephone number is 308-4253. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (703) 308-6824. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-0661.

then Tran

HT June 15, 2003

Hien Tran
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1764